

Chapter 4 Errata to Draft Program EIR

ERRATA

Final Program EIR

for the

City of Riverside General Plan Update, Zoning Code Update,
Subdivision Code Update, Citywide Design Guidelines, and Magnolia
Avenue Specific Plan

May 10, 2005

Revised October 14, 2005

May 10, 2005 Errata

In February 2005, the City of Riverside published the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Final PEIR) for the General Plan Update, Zoning Code Update, Subdivision Code Update, Citywide Design Guidelines, and Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan. Since publication of the Final PEIR, but prior to its certification by the Riverside City Council, in response to written comments received both during and after the formal public review period for the Draft FEIR, the City has determined it appropriate to make revisions to the Final PEIR that are non-substantive in nature. The City Council of the City of Riverside has elected to use written documents referenced as Erratas as the means by which information received prior to certification of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is memorialized. Each Errata is intended to clarify, amplify, or make insignificant modifications to the EIR. The term Errata does not and should not be interpreted to mean that significant error or mistake is present in the EIR.

The City has reviewed the EIR recirculation requirements as forth in 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 15088.5 and has determined that the following changes, clarifications, and/or amplifications do not constitute "significant new information," as such phrase is used in the State CEQA Guidelines, because the EIR prepared for this project is neither changed in any manner that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect arising from the project, nor is the City declining to implement either a feasible mitigation measure or impact avoidance measure.

In this Errata, revisions to the Final PEIR are identified by **shading**, as illustrated in this sentence, and as presented herein, are considered wholly part of the Final PEIR.

Table 3-1 (Zoning District – General Plan Land Use Correlation) on page 3-11 is revised as indicated on pages 2 and. Table 3-2 (Zone Changes) on page 3-12 is revised as indicated on pages 4 and 5.

**Table 3-1
Zoning District – General Plan Land Use Correlation**

Zoning District (Zone)	Zone Symbol	Corresponding General Plan Land Use Designation
Residential Agricultural	RA-5	Agriculture, Agricultural/Rural Residential
Residential Conservation	RC	Hillside Residential
Rural Residential	RR	Semi-Rural Residential
Residential Estate	RE, R-1-1/2 acre	Very Low Density Residential
Single-family Residential	RE R-1-1/2 acre R-1-13000 R-1-10500	Low Density Residential
Single-family Residential	RE R-1-1/2 acre R-1-13000 R-1-10500 R-1-8500 R-1-7000	Medium Density Residential
Medium High Density Residential	R-3-4000 R-3-3000	Medium High Density Residential
High Density Residential	R-3-4000 R-3-3000 R-3-2000 R-3-1500	High Density Residential
Very High Density Residential	R-4	Very High Density Residential
Office	O	Office
Commercial Retail	CR	Commercial
Commercial General	CG	Commercial
Commercial Regional Center	CRC	Commercial Regional Center
Mixed Use – Neighborhood	MU-N	Mixed Use – Neighborhood
Mixed Use – Village	MU-V	Mixed Use – Village
Mixed Use – Urban	MU-U	Mixed Use – Urban
Business and Manufacturing Park	BMP	Business/Office Park
General Industrial	I	Industrial
Air Industrial	AI	Business/Office Park
Airport	AIR PF	Industrial
Public Facilities	PF	Public Facilities, Open Space and Institutional Uses
Railway	RWY	All
Downtown Specific Plan	DSP	Downtown Specific Plan
All Zones	I	Private Recreation

Zoning District (Zone)	Zone Symbol	Corresponding General Plan Land Use Designation
Airport Protection Overlay	(AP)	All
Building Setback Overlay	(X)	All
Commercial Storage Overlay	(CS)	LDR, MDR, MHDR, HDR, O, C BMP, I, AI, AIR
Story Overlay	(S)	All
Mobile Home Park Overlay	(MH)	MDR
Neighborhood Commercial Overlay	(NC)	Commercial
Specific Plan Overlay	(SP)	All
Watercourse Overlay	(WC)	All

Table 3-2 Zone Changes

Old Zone	New Zone	Comment
Residential Zones		
HR (Horse Ranch)	RE (Residential Estate)	
RA (Agriculture)	RE (Residential Estate)	Emphasis on agriculture deleted. There are currently only 36 areas with this zoning in the City.
RA-2	Deleted	The RA-2 Zone will be deleted. There are no properties with this zoning at this time.
RA-5	RA-5	Retains minimum 5 acre lot size.
RR (Rural)	RR (Rural)	
RC (Conservation)	RC (Conservation)	
R-1-130	R-1-½ acre	
R-1-125	R-1-13000	
R-1-100	R-1-10500	
R-1-80	R-1-8500	
R-1-65	R-1-7000	
R-2 (Two-family)	Deleted	Deleted per direction of the City Council; properties will be rezoned appropriately.
R-3-R	R-3-2500	
R-3-40	R-3-4000	
R-3-30	R-3-3000	
R-3-20	R-3-2000	
R-3	R-3-1500	
R-3-H	R-4	Density lowered from 54 du/ac to 40 du/ac.
Commercial Zones		
RO (Restricted Office)	O (Office)	
P (Parking)	Deleted	The P Zone has been deleted; properties will be rezoned to appropriate designation. Parking structures and off-site parking lots will be permitted by CUP.
CO (Commercial Office)	Deleted	Zone deleted and combined with O zone. There are only 5 areas in the City with this zoning.
C-1 (Neighborhood Shopping Center)	CR-NC (Commercial Retail-Neighborhood Commercial)	NC overlay zone can be applied
C-1-A (Community Shopping Center)	CRC (Commercial Regional Center)	Regional shopping serving an area beyond Riverside
CL (Commercial Limited)	CR-NC (Commercial Retail-Neighborhood Commercial)	Zone deleted, replaced by CR-NC
C-2 (Restricted Commercial)	CR (Commercial Retail)	
C-3 (General Commercial)	CG (Commercial General)	Serving several neighborhoods and the community in general

Table 3-2 Zone Changes

Old Zone	New Zone	Comment
Industrial Zones		
MP (Manufacturing Park)	BMP (Business and Manufacturing Park)	Combined with the BP overlay zone to make BMP
M-1 (Light Industrial)	I (General Industrial)	M-1 and M-2 combined to create a new general manufacturing zone
M-2 (General Industrial)	Deleted	
Other Zones		
WC (Water Course)	WC (Water Course)	Converted to an Overlay Zone
FP (Floodplain)	Deleted	Properties in the FP Zone will be rezoned appropriately and most likely will include WC overlay zone.
RWY (Railway)	RWY (Railway)	Retained and revised slightly
AIR (Airport)	AIR (Airport)	
AI (Air Industrial)	AI (Air Industrial)	This is a zone to be applied in the future
DSP (Downtown Specific Plan)	DSP (Downtown Specific Plan)	
O (Official)	PF (Public Facilities)	Properties in the current O zone will be rezoned with appropriate zoning per adjacent land uses or rezoned PF
Overlay Zones		
BP (Business Park Overlay)	Deleted	The BP Overlay Zone is deleted.
D (Design Review)	Deleted	Redundant Overlay Zone
RL (Residential Livestock)	RL (Residential Livestock)	
S (Height of Building)	S (Building Height)	Change height to feet instead of stories to accomplish stated purpose
X (Building Setback)	X (Setback)	
SP (Specific Plan)	SP (Specific Plan)	
New Zones		
	MU-N	Mixed-use (Neighborhood)
	MU-V	Mixed-use (Village)
	MU-U	Mixed-use (Urban)
New Overlay Zones		
	AP	Airport Protection Overlay
	CS	Commercial Storage (Mini-storage)
	MH	Mobile Home Park Overlay
	NC	Neighborhood Commercial Overlay, provides additional neighborhood protections when commercial zones are adjacent to residential

On page 5.14-2 of the EIR, the following revisions are hereby added:

The 1975 Quimby Act (CGC §66477) authorized cities and counties to pass ordinances requiring that developers set aside land, donate conservation easements or pay park fees for park improvements. **Though the City of Riverside does not have a parkland dedication ordinance adopted, Riverside collects fees under AB 1600 to fund park improvements including the acquisition and development of new park facilities.**

The City of Riverside has 46 developed parks totaling **2,314.8** acres and 9 proposed parks that will total 206.6 acres when developed. Three regional County-owned parks, one reserve and one State park are also available in the City of Riverside for use by residents. **Table 5.14-2** describes parkland in the City including existing and proposed City-owned resources, and existing and proposed County-owned resources.

On page 5.14-3 of the EIR, the following revision is hereby incorporated into the EIR:

**Table 5.14-2
Park and Recreation Facilities**

Park #	Park Name	Location	Amenities	Acres
City-Owned/Maintained Facilities				
19	Islander Park	Mt. Vernon St. at Big Springs Rd.	Existing community pool with on-site parking and undeveloped park site	19.1

For clarification, the text on page 5.15-1 is augmented as follows:

The City of Riverside's local street system consists of arterials, collector, and local streets. The existing functional classification system is shown in **Figure 5-32**. Key arterials include Van Buren Boulevard, Arlington Avenue, Trautwein Road, Magnolia Avenue/Market Street, Iowa Avenue, Central Avenue, **La Sierra Avenue, Martin Luther King Boulevard/Fourteenth Street, Tyler Avenue, University Avenue** and Alessandro Boulevard.

On page 5.15-6 of the EIR, the references to the "flytrap" intersection will no longer apply. The intersection will be changed to the "Magnolia/Central/Brockton intersection" as shown:

The Magnolia/Central/Brockton intersection **has a** unique configuration and often **experiences** congested operating conditions.

On page 5.15-11, the following information is hereby added:

Under 2004 **peak-hour** conditions **(morning and afternoon)**, nearly all segments of freeways within the Planning Area are operating at LOS F, with only some portions of the I-215 operating at or better than LOS D. **Table 5.15-4** below identifies LOS for freeway segments throughout the Planning Area. LOS F freeway conditions in the Planning Area indicate that freeway demand exceeds capacity **during peak hours**. These oversubscribed conditions have the potential to contribute to increased traffic on local streets, as freeway on-ramps back up onto local streets and local arterials become attractive alternative routes. Van Buren Boulevard and

Alessandro Boulevard in particular are estimated to be used by many through-drivers seeking to avoid congestion at the 91/215/60 interchange.

On page 5.15-16, the following information is hereby added:

Several regional and subregional transportation plans and programs apply to the City of Riverside. They include the Riverside County Congestion Management Program (CMP), the Southern California Association of Governments Comprehensive Transportation Plan (SCAG/CTP), the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the Regional Transportation Plan, and the Riverside County Community and Environmental Transportation Acceptability process (CETAP) plan, a part of the Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP) that identifies alternative routes for possible major new multi-modal transportation facilities to serve the current and future transportation needs of Western Riverside County. In addition to the above transportation planning programs, the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) is a funding source for transportation improvements for participating cities in western Riverside County.

On page 5.15-21, the following information is hereby added:

Metrolink commuter rail service consists of heavy rail lines into downtown Los Angeles and Orange County. Metrolink is operated by the Southern California Regional Rail Authority. Lines serving downtown Los Angeles are Metrolink 91 and the Riverside Line. Service to Orange County is via the Inland Empire-Orange County line. All lines stop at the two Metrolink stations in the City of Riverside: one just east of Downtown and one in La Sierra. Amtrak service is also available at the Downtown Metrolink station. As of 2004, the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) and Metrolink were cooperatively planning the development of a new Perris Valley Line, a 22.7-mile extension of the Metrolink 91 line. Longer-term plans for the railway call for extensions eastward to the City of Hemet. As of 2004, the precise alignment of the Perris Valley line had not been determined.

On page 5.15-28 of the EIR, the references to the "flytrap" intersection will no longer apply. The intersection will be changed to the "Magnolia/Central/Brockton intersection" as shown:

Magnolia/Central/Brockton Intersection

Conceptual improvements are assumed for all but one City intersection, the intersection of Magnolia Avenue, Central Avenue and Brockton Avenue. The Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan sets forth two closely related improvement alternatives for this intersection. The alternatives are discussed below.

On page 5.15-38, the following source information is hereby added to Table 5.15-8:

**Table 5.15-8
Future Freeway Level of Service**

Segment	Existing ADT	Existing Peak Hour Volume	Existing LOS	Future ADT	Future LOS	Percentage of Future Trips Starting/Ending in Planning Area
State Route 91						
Pierce St to Magnolia Ave	176,000	14,700	F	207,388	F	25%
Magnolia Ave to La Sierra Ave	178,000	14,900	F	212,021	F	26%
La Sierra Ave to Tyler St	178,000	14,900	F	201,994	F	33%
Tyler St to Van Buren Blvd	180,000	15,100	F	223,970	F	34%
Van Buren Blvd to Adams St	174,000	14,600	F	210,860	F	35%
Adams St to Madison St	176,000	14,700	F	207,363	F	34%
Madison St to Arlington Ave	176,000	14,300	F	210,496	F	36%
Arlington Ave to Central Ave	177,000	14,200	F	194,074	F	35%
Central Ave to 14th St	172,000	13,600	F	218,697	F	38%
14th St to University Ave	171,000	13,400	F	222,644	F	38%
University Ave to Mulberry St	162,000	12,600	F	211,011	F	36%
Mulberry St to La Cadena Dr	162,000	12,400	F	211,011	F	36%
La Cadena Dr to SR-60	160,000	12,400	E	211,011	F	36%
I-215/SR 60						
SR-60 to Spruce St	183,000	15,600	F	293,672	F	17%
Spruce St to 3rd St/Blaine St	171,000	14,700	F	293,672	F	17%
3rd St/Blaine St to University Ave	170,000	14,800	F	287,065	F	17%
University Ave to Martin Luther King Blvd	177,000	15,400	F	301,093	F	17%
Martin Luther King Blvd to El Cerrito Dr	181,000	16,300	F	308,012	F	16%
El Cerrito Dr to Central Ave	188,000	16,900	F	308,012	F	16%
Central Ave to Box Springs Rd	180,000	16,200	F	324,521	F	16%
Box Springs Rd to SR-60	110,000	8,900	C	322,302	F	16%
SR-60 to Eastridge Ave	112,000	9,000	E	185,017	F	12%
Eastridge Ave to Alessandro Blvd	106,000	9,000	E	197,972	F	18%
Alessandro Blvd to Frontage Rd	104,000	8,900	D	200,519	F	18%
Frontage Rd to Van Buren Blvd	105,000	9,000	D	202,308	F	16%

Source: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc. and Caltrans, 2004

On page 5.15-63 of the Draft PEIR, clarifying language is added as highlighted below regarding the City's versus Caltrans' roles in accomplishing freeway improvements:

Development consistent with Project implementation will facilitate new growth in the Planning Area that can be expected to generate additional traffic on regional freeways. Analysis indicates that under Project buildout conditions, all freeway segments in the Planning Area will operate at LOS F. Although analysis indicates that the freeway traffic attributable to Project buildout accounts for about one-third or

less of freeway traffic increases, the impacts are nevertheless considered significant and unavoidable. As freeways are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, the City has no authority to make improvements **to the freeway system** that could potentially lessen the impacts of Project-related traffic. As regional traffic (trips that neither begin nor end in the City of Riverside) constitutes a significant component of projected freeway traffic, it is unlikely that even a complete development moratorium in the City of Riverside could lead to acceptable levels of service on Riverside's freeway segments. Indeed, such a moratorium would likely have the impact of pushing new development farther north, east and south of the City, with little if any tangible improvement to freeway operations.

The following information about the disposal capacity and allowable acreage for waste disposal of Lamb Canyon Landfill is hereby updated on pages 5.16-40 and 5.16-4.

Lamb Canyon Landfill: The Lamb Canyon Landfill is located between the City of Beaumont and the City of San Jacinto at 16411 Lamb Canyon Road (State Route 79). The landfill encompasses approximately 1,088 acres, of which **144.6** acres are permitted **for waste disposal**. The landfill is currently permitted to receive **3,000** tpd **of trash** for disposal and has a remaining disposal capacity of approximately **13,096,686** tons as of **January 1, 2004**. **During the year 2003**, the landfill received a total tonnage of **197,944**, averaging **615** tons per day. **The current remaining disposal capacity is estimated to last until** approximately 2023. Further landfill expansion potential also exists on the site.

On page 5.16-45 of the EIR, the following additional implementation action, incorporated within the project, is hereby added:

- **The City will review all development projects to ensure that waste generated from construction activities is recycled to the greatest extent feasible.**

Changes to the Master Plan of Roadways and Figure 5-38

In response to Letter 5 in the Response to Comments document submitted by the Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency, the City of Riverside has agreed that changes will be made to the Master Plan of Roadways (Figure 5-38) as a part of the public hearing process. All of these revisions are minor and do not change any of the conclusions made in the EIR. These changes are listed below.

Additions

The following roadways will be added to the Master Plan of Roadways:

"A" Street - The "A" Street connection proposed under the recent joint City/County planning effort for roadway alignments will be added in the Rancho El Sobrante area. This would include the realignment of McAllister Street to connect to La Sierra Avenue in the vicinity of Dufferin Avenue and the addition of a new collector road from McAllister Street easterly to Van Buren Boulevard. These modifications serve to ease the impacts to City

residents along McAllister Street southerly of Victoria Avenue and to Victoria Avenue through the greenbelt.

Barton Road - Barton Road between Alessandro Boulevard and Grove Community Parkway will be shown on the plan as being a 66 Foot Collector.

Iris Avenue - Iris Avenue between Washington Street and Chicago Avenue will be shown as a 66 Foot Local Road.

Dauchy Avenue - Dauchy Avenue between Gention Avenue and Van Buren Boulevard will be shown as a 66 Foot Local Road.

Deletions

With the addition of "A" Street, the unnamed 88 foot arterial between La Sierra Avenue and Vista Del Lago that parallels El Sobrante Road on Figure 5.39, also known as Blackburn Road, will be deleted.

Reclassifications

The following roadways will be reclassified in the Master Plan of Roadways:

Chicago Avenue south of Roberts Road and Gention Avenue between Chicago Avenue and Wood Road will be reclassified as a 66 Foot Local Road.

Note #4 on the Master Plan of Roadways (Figure 5.39 in the EIR) will be revised as follows:

Roberts Road and certain portions of Barton Road, Iris Avenue, Dauchy Avenue, and Chicago Avenue shall be 66-Foot Local Roadways serving as alternate routes.

October 14, 2005 Errata

On September 2, 2005, the City of Riverside received a letter from the Morongo Band of Mission Indians (Tribe); a copy of the letter is attached. The letter was in response to an August 9, 2005 consultation letter from the City to the Tribe pursuant to Government Code §65352.3 (SB18). The following responses are provided to address comments in the Tribe's letter.

Comment E-1

The Tribe suggests adding the language to the General Plan and EIR stating consultation will occur on general plan and specific plan actions.

Response E-1

Since no significant effect on cultural resources will occur as a result of General Plan adoption, mitigation is not required. Thus, to address the Tribe's comment, the City will add the following policy to the General Plan:

Policy LU-4.6: Ensure protection of prehistoric resources through consultations with the Native American Heritage Commission pursuant to Government Code §65352.3 and as required by the California Environmental Quality Act.

Comment E-2

The Tribe suggests inserting the word "confidential" into Policy 4.1 in the Historic Preservation Element.

Response E-2

The recommended amendment will be made. As a matter of policy, the City does not release Native American site information to the public.

Comment E-3

The Tribe recommends that policies be included in the General Plan and mitigation measures in the EIR to reflect recommendations included in the Cultural Resource background report regarding consultation.

Response E-3

Please see response E-1.

Comment E-4

The Tribe requests that the City respond in writing to the subject letter as part of the negotiation process.

Response E-4

The City welcomes the comments received and is committed to consultation on all applicable projects. The Tribe will receive a copy of this Errata document with any other required documentation.

LETTER E

October 5, 2005

Ms. Diane E. Jenkins
Principal Planner
City of Riverside
3900 Main Street
Riverside, CA 92522

OCT - 7 2005

MORONGO
BAND OF
MISSION
INDIANS



Re: City of Riverside General Plan/EIR

Dear Diane,

Thank you for your August 9, 2005 addressed to Tribal Chairman Maurice Lyons concerning the above referenced project in relation to Government Code §65352.3 (SB18). I have been asked to respond to the City of Riverside's offer for consultation. Thank you also for meeting with me on September 1, 2005 to discuss the consultation process and the City's General Plan.

As you know, the Morongo Band of Mission Indians ("Tribe") has 90 days in which to respond whether it wishes to consult or not. The Morongo Band of Mission Indians ("Tribe"), however, sees itself as a partner with the city in this important project so it wishes to respond quickly to avoid unnecessary delays. The mutual goal of the Tribe and the city should be to ensure that Native American cultural resources are given due and respectful consideration. To that end, the Tribe is hereby requesting formal, government-to-government consultation on the above referenced project(s).

As we discussed at our meeting, the City did such a great job in not only providing materials to the Tribe, but also addressing cultural resources in the EIR and General Plan, that the Tribe will have limited comments. In addition, the City of Riverside is well known for its commitment to protecting historical and archaeological resources.

The Tribe's comments are as follows:

- Because the documents were initiated and developed prior to SB18, the Tribe would suggest you add some discussion about SB18 in the General Plan/EIR. A sample General Plan policy or EIR mitigation might read:
 - The City shall comply with Government Code §65352.3 (i.e. SB18) by conducting formal consultations with tribes as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission on all general plan and specific plan actions. (For example, this might be added to Policy 1.3 on page 5.5-16 of the EIR.) E-1
- Policy 4.1 on page 5.5-18 of the EIR: This policy discusses the City establishing a database. The Tribe would suggest that the City consider E-2

October 5, 2005
Ms. Diane E. Jenkins
City of Riverside
Page 2 of 3

adding the word "confidential" at least in terms of Native American cultural resources. In other words, if this database/map shows Native American sites, it should not be available to the general public.

E-2

- The Tribe notes that the cultural resources report prepared for the General Plan/EIR indicates that if prehistoric archaeological resources are encountered on a development site, "the City should require that the project proponent consult with Native American Heritage Commission in Sacramento to acquire a list of local Native American who may have an interest in these resources; consultation within these Native Americans should also be undertaken." (Section 6.3.1, Cultural Resource Mitigation Measure 1, page 57). The Tribe fully supports this and requests that it be made part of the General Plan/EIR.

The Tribe wishes to highlight/explain the *consultation* comment concerning the discovery of cultural resources (i.e. Native American artifacts). Many cultural resource firms' recommendations and city conditions on development projects state that any artifacts recovered shall be curated or donated to some museum or historical society. Some artifacts are even deemed "not significant" and are either destroyed or retained by the archaeologist, city or county, or developer. The Tribe feels strongly that it should be invited to participate in the disposition of certain artifacts including asking that certain artifacts be returned to the Tribe.

E-3

Therefore, the Tribe, under our government-to-government consultation asks that it be given the opportunity to provide input on the disposition of artifacts, including the possible donation or return of items to the Tribe. A General Plan/EIR policy/mitigation requiring the project proponent to consult with the Tribe on Native American cultural resources would address the Tribe's needs.

In summation, the Tribe asks that a policy or mitigation be included within the General Plan/EIR covering the Tribe's participation in the disposition of artifacts found on a development site (which would be consistent with the cultural resources report prepared for the City).

It is important to understand that the City and the Tribe are in formal, government-to-government consultations pursuant to Government Code §65352.3; the Tribe is NOT merely providing public comments or "reviewing agency" comments. Consultation is to be conducted in good faith and is considered complete when, if feasible, both parties agree.

E-4

The Tribe's view is that written records of our consultation substantiate those "good faith" negotiations and reflect the final outcome of the consultation. In that

October 5, 2005
Ms. Diane E. Jenkins
City of Riverside
Page 3 of 3


light, the Tribe would ask that the city respond in writing to the Tribe's consultation comments, at which point we will know if we reached agreement or not. Until the Tribe receives your response, it shall consider our consultation *open and ongoing*. As you know, state law reads that consultation must take place prior to adoption of any general (or specific) plan adoption; therefore, it is important to document and conclude our consultations so the City can finalize these projects.

E-4

The Tribe commends the City for working with the Tribe. It realizes the importance of this project to the City and looks forward to a mutually beneficial relationship during the consultation process. Thank you again for contacting the Tribe.

If you have any questions in the interim, please contact me at (951) 755-5206 or Britt_wilson@morongo.org

Sincerely,



Britt W. Wilson
Project Manager/Cultural Resources Coordinator